rights with Comcast?

A We do. We are currently a licensee for one of the packages for Wimbledon. And, you know, I -- I mean, this is something that I think needs to be kept --

Q All right.

A This is sort of a business issue, but I think I can say broadly that we have been -- that there are multiple packages, and that all of them are coming up for renewal in the next -- soon, I will say, without being specific, for the press purposes.

And Wimbledon is obviously very,
very important to us. We have had a great
relationship with the Wimbledon, and they told
us -- the club who licenses the rights has
told us that they are speaking to Comcast
about not only renewing the NBC relationship,
which by the way has been very good with us as
well. We have had a great relationship up
until now with NBC.

We actually produce the French

Open for NBC. They have a few hours, and we actually produce that for them. So up until now it has been a wonderful relationship.

But the cable part, which is many, many, many hundreds of hours is coming up for grabs, and they have told us that we are now competing and we are -- with Versus, which is the owned network of Comcast, for those future rights.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, when is the Davis Cup played? I'm sorry, I've got the dates for the other ones, but when is the Davis Cup played?

THE WITNESS: It is actually played all year long. It is a series of contests that starts towards the beginning of the year, and the finals happen in the fourth quarter. So you have about I believe it's 16 teams that play around the world.

And by the way, there is a women's version of the Davis Cup. The Davis Cup is the men's. The women's is called the Fed Cup,

so -- Venus Williams was just on the team for us, which we had on our air a couple of weeks ago. And it starts in the beginning of the year, and it is played up until the final contest to find out who the winning team of the world is at the end of the year. Spain is going to be tough to beat. They have got a good team this year, so we'll see.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.

BY MR. PHILLIPS:

Q Mr. Solomon, besides programming rights, are there other ways that you compete with Comcast-owned sports channels?

A Sure. All of the ways that networks compete. Probably the next most important one -- it's hard to say which is most important -- is advertising.

Advertisers decide who they are going to advertise on based on different thresholds of distribution, and you can imagine that when we are in under three million Comcast homes, and their owned

networks are in 23 million Comcast homes, combined with our other distribution, that that gives them a great advantage.

So it's -- you know, we -- a significant portion of the revenue that an emerging network generates comes from advertising, and it is the most important thing to an advertiser outside of the environment that their product is going to be marketed in, and clearly we have done very well in that regard with the Emmy wins. And they know that it's a Tiffany environment that gives great brand association.

It's how many people do you reach?

And obviously, with limited reach, there are
many advertisers who simply -- under 30

million homes or under 40 million homes or
under 50 million homes, simply won't place an
order. And being blocked in, again, one of
almost every four homes in the country, minus
10 percent, creates a significant financial
hardship.

Q Well, now, Mr. Solomon, I bet when
you go in to advertisers you don't tell them
that you are just like the Golf Channel.

After all, that is a different sport, right?

A Well, no. Like most people, the closer you are as a competitor, probably the more you point out your differences. I think of Coke and Pepsi all the time, because those two companies have probably spent more money trying to prove how different they are, and I can't really tell the difference between them.

But our job is to within our -one of the marketing jobs, and it depends, is
to point out within our subset, you know,
where our similarities are and where our
differences are.

Q Has your load distribution had any impact, do you think, on the sport of tennis?

A Sure. Well, the sport itself is dramatically impacted. I mean, I think everybody who is in the business understands that the fate of a sport in this country is

largely tied to its fate on television. There was a time when the NFL was not doing so well in the late '90s, and it was because CBS was suffering, and they decided to move to Fox in order to do better. NASCAR became a huge hit when NBC and Fox took over.

The sport of tennis is in -- has been in a resurgence for the last 10 years.

It is at an all-time -- nearly an all-time high in terms of playing. Over 30 million people are playing, more people are watching, ratings are up. Things are good.

But the limited distribution is obviously -- has a significant impact, and there is probably no other sports network that more represents its sport than ours, because, again, substantively every top hundred contest in the world, including all the year-end finals and the Davis Cup and the men's tour and the women's tour and the grand slams are on our air.

So tennis has suffered, and, more

importantly, the tennis fans have suffered, because, well, we get a lot of e-mails saying, "How come I have to pay for Tennis Channel or tennis just to see tennis, but I don't have to pay" -- and they take it out on us, because they think we are in charge -- "but I don't have to pay for golf, even secondary or tertiary golf, I don't have to pay for hockey or football or baseball. I don't have to pay for cage fighting. I don't want to see that. I want to see tennis."

And so it does have a significant impact on the fortunes of the sport. And then, the other piece that obviously is the -- may be the biggest of all is the distribution itself. The largest component of revenue for an emerging network, as just about anyone in the business knows, is the distribution revenue.

And even though we have offered it at a much discounted rate, not being able to get -- being able to only get a fraction of

what Comcast is able to pay themselves
obviously puts us at a competitive
disadvantage if we are against Golf, Versus,
and their other owned networks.

And that is probably -- and that ultimately manifests itself not only in cash but in terms of awareness. Our job is for people to be able to flip through the channels and see, hey, there -- maybe it's a golf tournament if they want to see a golf tournament, maybe it's a tennis tournament if they want to see a tennis tournament. If they flip through and they can't see it, they don't know it's there. And if you say to them, "Gee, I have to pay \$5 or \$6 to get it, that makes it a much higher hurdle than just turning the channel."

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, I have a couple of questions just about specifics, the specific numbers on the offers made. And it -- but those are things I can't do in public session.

JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well,

I'll address that in just a minute. Let me

ask just one question here. I try and figure

out, how does this premium get charged? If a

customer is going to be a customer of Comcast,

that for one reason or another wants to see

The Tennis Channel, they don't contact The

Tennis Channel, I guess they contact Comcast,

is that right?

THE WITNESS: That's correct. The way it works is that Comcast offers a variety of packages. Every month when you get your Comcast bill, they presumably say you can buy this one, this one, this one, or this one.

The package The Tennis Channel is on, which doesn't have any other -- any Comcast sports networks on it at all, but it's called a sports tier, ironically -- they say to you,

"Next month, if you want this, give us \$5 or \$6 more a month."

What is interesting is we are only charging 15 cents or less, and yet it would

Page 301 1 cost you \$5 a month to get the sports package 2 to get --3 JUDGE SIPPEL: You are charging 4 Comcast --5 THE WITNESS: We are charging 6 Comcast --7 JUDGE SIPPEL: -- 15 cents or 8 less. 9 THE WITNESS: -- 15 cents and 10 they want to charge \$5. 11 JUDGE SIPPEL: Is this okay to talk -- like about this? Is this okay? 12 13 THE WITNESS: Well, I think those 14 numbers have been published before, so -- I'm 15 using 15 cents as a round number. It has been 16 published. 17 MR. PHILLIPS: To talk about the further details of that, Your Honor -- and I 18 19 hate to do it -- I'm sorry -- but I --20 JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no, no, no, 21 that's okay. I'm sorry myself. I didn't mean 22 to pry that deeply. But I'm just trying to

Page 302 figure out, how does this work. So it -- I'm 1 2 going to ask one more question. MR. PHILLIPS: Well, that's --3 4 Your Honor, the stage is yours. It's as big 5 as you want. 6 JUDGE SIPPEL: Is it a la carte? 7 For five bucks more you can get -- for five 8 bucks more a month, right? 9 THE WITNESS: Correct. 10 JUDGE SIPPEL: You can get tennis 11 games, but does that mean that you've got to 12 get a whole bunch of other things, or are they 13 a la carte? 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, it does. It's 15 not a la carte. You get soccer and some other 16 channels, but -- that Comcast does now. 17 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. All right. 18 That's it for me. I'm sorry. 19 Let's go into closed session. 20 MR. PHILLIPS: It's a closed 2.1 session, but it's really only a couple of

questions. And I just want to get on the

22

#### 

#### CLOSED SESSION

## 

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. PHILLIPS:

Q Mr. Solomon, the offer that you made to Comcast in May of '09, can you describe it for me in detail and give the prices?

A Sure.

, and the -- we give what we call volume discounts in the business. So the more subscribers you give us, the less you have to pay per subscriber.

In this particular case, even
though we were already among the cheapest, if
not the very least expensive -- I think there
might be one or two more that are less
expensive, but certainly nowhere near the
value proposition that we are offering for
that price -- we said to Comcast in that
meeting that we would offer them either a midlevel of distribution at about per

subscriber, so a significant discount, and if
they wanted to virtually double that level of
distribution, give or take a million or a
couple million homes, to the highest level we
were asking for which is not the highest
level. We were asking for I think at the
time, what was it, about
homes on that one, and the mid-level was about
half that.

We would drop it down to about per subscriber making it about half what the normal rate card was. In real numbers, that would be a significant discount from where we had been off our already low prices. And, again, some of that benefit would trickle far beyond Comcast to our other distributors.

Q Do you know how much, on an annualized basis, that and would turn out to be for Comcast?

A Yeah, it -- you know, the big

question that we were trying to answer is, how

can we make sure this is an offer they can't refuse? Matt had made it clear that we had to make it seem very attractive to him.

And so the first thing we did is we did our homework. There are regularly published pricing on all of the networks that are out there, and they are close. They are not perfect, but they are close enough that most of the industry basis -- a lot of it is revenue analyses on them.

And here is why we thought it was going to be great. Just make sure that door closes. For the industry published information, it said that during 2010 Comcast was going to pay itself about

to carry Versus. They were going to pay themselves about to carry Golf Channel, just for the 2010 year.

Our offer meant that if they gave us the mid-level of distribution, it would be about . And if it were the higher level of distribution, it would be about

Page 307 1 , I think , something 2 like that. 3 So we looked at this not only as a 4 significant discount off what the rate would 5 have been anyway, which was already inexpensive, but also, again, a fraction of 6 7 what they were paying themselves for networks 8 that were similar, if not slightly inferior. 9 And the other thing was --10 JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you give me 11 those numbers again? 12 THE WITNESS: Sure. 13 JUDGE SIPPEL: With Versus, Versus 14 was how much, how many million? 15 THE WITNESS: About 16 , give or take, for 2010. 17 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. in 2010. 18 19 THE WITNESS: And those rate cards 20 are fixed, so they are paying themselves 21 presumably what they are paying other people, 22 we would assume.

1	Page 308  JUDGE SIPPEL: Right. And Golf
2	was how much?
3	THE WITNESS: Golf was about .
4	JUDGE SIPPEL:
5	THE WITNESS: For the year.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: For 2010.
7	THE WITNESS: Correct.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
9	THE WITNESS: We offered one offer
10	of and one offer of .
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: I see that. Those
12	numbers I have, okay.
13	THE WITNESS: Okay? The only
14	other thing was that we already had a bunch of
15	other incentives, like Matt was asking for,
16	that were already on the table that they could
17	continue to enjoy, one of them being the
18	, and that there was still
19	left on the contract.
20	
21	
22	. It's

a good deal for them. It's real cash out the door for us, but something that we are willing to do.

They would continue to enjoy that for some time, and they had other incentives, like there is a that we were required to pay Comcast, a subsidiary of Comcast called CMC, which is their technical facility, whether we availed ourselves of any of those services or not. I don't know that we ever have. We may have used some of them, but it's not something that we really needed, but we were required to pay them. All those would continue to remain in effect — in effect discounts off the price that we had already offered them.

JUDGE SIPPEL: How much would CMC cost you?

19 THE WITNESS: About

20 overall.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.

BY MR. PHILLIPS:

Q Mr. Solomon, I really only have one more question for you, which is, what are you hoping to achieve by this lawsuit, sir?

A Well, all we really want to do is level the playing field. I mean, our goal is to compete effectively against our competitive networks. And our competitive networks happen to be owned largely by our -- what could be potentially our largest distributor and is the largest distributor in this country.

We think we have a great business. We think we can bring us both great value, but we can't do it unless we are treated the same way they treat their own. So we are hoping that we can effectuate that and move on and have a great relationship with Comcast and make everybody happy.

Q What if they move Golf and Versus up to a more narrowly restricted tier?

A That would be fine. All we have ever asked for is to be treated the same.

There is really no separate but equal in this,

and we have kind of lived that time and again. And if they felt that the best business place to put sports networks like Golf, Versus, and Tennis Channel were on the tier that we're on now, then that would be what we would live with.

Q And how would that help you, to be on a tier with further -- with more channels on it?

A Well, obviously, it would bring more attention to it. Comcast would probably spend more time marketing the sports tier because their own network would be on it, and we think they could do very well because they could sell the two of them together. Comcast gets a lot of local time in Tennis Channel if they do this, and it seems like golf and tennis would be a perfect thing for them to put together and market together. It seems like a natural -- and, frankly, many, many, many other distributors have done it just that way.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Solomon, thank
you very much.

Your Honor, I don't have any further questions.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me just get a couple of clarifications. Was there any offer of an equity position in Tennis Channel made to Mr. Bond or to -- in those negotiations?

negotiations were just discussing. It wasn't asked for, and it wasn't rejected or proffered. There had been in the past, because of our Most Favored Nations requirements, the offer of increased distribution and the opportunity to trade free period for equity on a similar basis to the way those -- the Dish deal and the DirecTV deal had happened. But those were not at the same time as the meetings in 2009.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Those were prior discussions and that subject --

1 THE WITNESS: Correct.

JUDGE SIPPEL: -- never came up

3 again like in --

THE WITNESS: It didn't come up during these discussions.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And how was the decision made, or who made -- well, how was the decision made, just what are the dynamics that you were going to -- that this has reached the point where you decide you are going to sue Comcast? When I say "you," I mean, you know, Tennis Channel.

as we told them many times, it's the last thing we wanted to do. We got to that point when, on Mr. Bond's rejection of what we felt was an offer that he encouraged us -- clearly encouraged us to make, that he not only said no, but refused to negotiate.

At that point, when you had all four grand slams, every top hundred tournament, had done everything they asked

for, offered them a significant price discount over our already inexpensive price, we realized it didn't matter what we would do.

They were never going to move us, and it became clear that the decision had been made before we even started these discussions, and

that we were just being led down the path.

At that point, we had nothing to lose, because we weren't being treated the same and it didn't matter what we did. They don't make a fifth grand slam, so we couldn't get that. And we just said, "There is no other choice. We might as well see -- we think there is a difference of agreement here. We have to see if it will get settled fairly," because it seemed clear to us that we weren't getting fair treatment or similar treatment to what they were doing for themselves.

JUDGE SIPPEL: So after the loss -- well, I'm not going to ask that question.

But I'm talking about the dynamics of -- did you have to have a special meeting of the

Board of Directors, or just a meeting of the Board of Directors, to discuss this with the Board members?

THE WITNESS: Very much. Very much. We talked to the Board. When we talk about distribution matters with our Board, two of our Board members are also members of distribution companies, and they recused themselves.

But at that point, I think the

Board was -- who are very savvy in the matters

of cable companies, they are either former

executives who have had experience with cable

in some cases, or private equity investors who

are media savvy, and were frustrated, were

disappointed, and felt that we had no other

alternative. So that's not a unilateral

decision I would make without consulting the

Board.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, may I

follow up on one question you asked?

	Page 316
1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure.
2	BY MR. PHILLIPS:
3	Q Just to be very clear, you said,
4	Mr. Solomon, I believe, that some of your
5	Board members recused yourselves on things
6	like distribution issues or lawsuits about
7	distribution issues. Could you tell me which
8	Board members those are who recused
9	themselves?
10	A Sure. Two of our 10 Board
11	members, so one of them is Dan Hartman, who
12	works at DirecTV, and one of them is Caroline
13	Chang, who works Caroline Crawford, sorry,
14	who works at Dish Network.
15	Q And they recused themselves from
16	anything having to do with distribution
17	issues?
18	A Yes.
19	MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: And Mr. Hartman was

THE WITNESS: He is at DirecTV.

21

22

where?

Page 317 1 JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. Thank 2 That's all. you. 3 Mr. Carroll, your witness, sir. 4 MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Your 5 Honor, 6 Now, I've got a lot to ask Mr. 7 Solomon. I guess I should do the numbers 8 piece first. 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. So we're not 10 going to bring anybody back in again. 11 MR. CARROLL: If I get rid of the 12 numbers piece now --13 JUDGE SIPPEL: I agree with you. 14 MR. CARROLL: -- it seems to me 15 that's the most efficient way. 16 JUDGE SIPPEL: I agree. Thank 17 you, I agree. 18 MR. CARROLL: So I want to follow 19 up on this lawsuit piece. I want to follow up 20 on this meeting. It would be the natural 21 thing for me to do, Your Honor. I'm just 22 going to hold those for one second, and I'm